

Serial No. 10/091,584

**REMARKS**

In accordance with the foregoing, claims 1, 13 and 14 have been amended. Claims 1-14 are pending and under consideration.

On June 27, 2006, Examiner Pierre and her supervisor kindly granted the undersigned a personal interview to discuss the application. The Examiners' time in preparing for and conducting the interview is acknowledged and gratefully appreciated. It is noted that if Patent Office records require issuance of an Examiner Interview Record, the undersigned has not yet received such a summary record.

The sole issue remaining in this application is a rejection of claims 1-14 under 35 U.S.C. § 102 (e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,246,981 to Papineni. During the interview, applicant argued that the reference does not output, in the event of detection of a global help command, the sub-substates and transactions available. Claim 1 described that this is done "either by a help prompt followed by an enumeration of transaction prompts or by a question prompt and a transaction prompt." The Examiners cited column 14, line 8, for example of the reference, which indicates "buy which fund?" The Examiners argued that this is a question prompting the user for a transaction. Thus, the Examiners argued that both "question prompt" and "transaction prompt" read on column 14, line 8. To avoid this situation, the independent claims have been amended to eliminate the alternative. That is, referring to claim 1, for example, this claim recites "the sub-substates and transactions available being output by a help prompt followed by an enumeration of transaction prompts."

The Examiner seemed to agree that Papineni does not disclose the claims as amended. It should be noted that Papineni contains several portions, which should not be confused with one another. For example, column 15, lines 18-21 indicate that possible funds include the vanguard index trust, growth, small cap stock, small cap stock institutional shares, total stock market or total stock market institutional shares. Certainly, this is an enumeration of possibilities. However, this excerpt, which is found in Appendix B, does not relate to what happens when a global help command is detected. Within Appendix B, column 14, line 65 mentions the global help command. However, the global help command is not used in the Appendix B dialog.

On the other hand, Appendix A of Papineni does relate to a help scenario. However, there is nothing in Appendix A which enumerates the transaction prompts.

The prior art previously used either a tree structure to navigate to the requested transaction in combination with a context-sensitive help or a dialog machine based on the flat

Serial No. 10/091,584

earth principle to navigate to the requested transaction in combination with a not-context-sensitive help (also based on the flat earth principle). The present invention, however, provides a dialog machine based on the flat earth principle to navigate to the requested transaction in combination with a context-sensitive help.

The present invention achieves this by defining substates and sub-substates for a hierarchical structuring of the help function. In contrast to tree-structure based systems, where transactions and help functions are structured, the specification describes that the transactions do not need to be structured, but can be arranged coequally according to the "flat earth" principle. See transactions T1-T12 in Fig.1 On the other hand, the help functions can be arranged independently from the transaction, and the help functions can be structured. Figs. 2-4 show how the help functions for transactions T1-T21 are hierarchically structured by defining substates containing transactions or transactions and further substates. For more information, the Examiners are referred to paragraphs [0071] to [0102] of the specification.

Because Papineni does not disclose or suggest that in the event of detection of a global help command, sub-substates and transactions available are output by a help prompt followed by an enumeration of transaction prompts, as claimed. Accordingly, the prior art rejection should be withdrawn.

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: July 18 2006

By: Mark J. Henry

Mark J. Henry  
Registration No. 96162

FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being transmitted via facsimile to: Commissioner for Patents

P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

on July 18 2006

STAAS & HALEY

By: T. Coffey

Date July 18 2006